

***Remarks***

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-19, and 21-33 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 15, and 27 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 15, and 27 are amended by the foregoing amendment. Claims 20 and 34-36 are sought to be canceled by the foregoing amendment without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and that they be withdrawn.

***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-12, 15-22, 25, 26, 34, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,954,625 to Crowley (hereinafter "Crowley"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites a method of compensating for passband variation of a bandpass filter, and has been amended to include the steps of:

*disabling an RF input signal applied to an RF port of said first mixer so that said RF port receives no signal input during a calibration mode;....*

*enabling said RF input signal applied to said RF port of said first mixer.*

(See, Claim 1, amended)

In other words, Applicants invention disables the RF port of the first mixer so no signal is received, while applying the LO signal to LO port of the first mixer. Accordingly, Applicants' invention relies on the LO-to-IF leakage of the first mixer to characterize the bandpass filter.

In contrast, Crowley injects a reference oscillator signal 6 into the RF port of mixer 5, and mixes this with a local oscillator signal 8 that injected in the LO port of the mixer 5. (See, Crowley, FIG. 1, col. 5, lines 25-30 ) The result of Crowley is that a down-converted IF signal at the output of the mixer is used to characterize the filter 10. As stated above, to do so, Crowley injects a reference oscillator 6 into the RF input of the mixer 5. Whereas, Applicants' claimed invention *disables the RF input signal to the RF port of the first mixer so that no that the RF port receives no signal input during calibration*. As such, the LO signal itself characterizes the filter in Applicant's invention, not a down-converted IF signal. As a result, Applicants' calibration procedure is more efficient and requires less components that that described by Crowley.

The Examiner is reminded that the present rejection is an anticipation rejection, which requires that each and every feature be taught by a single reference. (See, MPEP 2131). Based on the discussion above, it is clear that Crowley does not teach each and every feature of claim 1, and therefore does not anticipate claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 § U.S.C. 102 be reconsidered and removed. Claims 2-14 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, and therefore are allowable for being dependent on an allowable base claim 1, in addition to their own patentable features. Accordingly, Applicants request that all these claims be passed to allowance.

Independent claims 15 and 27 recite features similar to those of claim 1 discussed above, and therefore are allowable over Crowley for the same reasons as discussed above. Claims 16-19 and 21-26 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 15 and 27, respectively, and therefore are allowable for being dependent on an allowable base claim in addition to their own patentable features. Accordingly, Applicants request

that the rejection under 35 § U.S.C. 102 be removed and that all these claims be passed to allowance.

Claims 34-36 have been canceled rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 5, 10, 14, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crowley. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and respectfully request this rejection be removed and these claims be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 5, 10, and 14 depend upon independent claim 1. As discussed above, independent claim 1 is allowable over Crowley for the reasons mentioned above. Accordingly, dependent claims 5, 10, and 14 are allowable for at least being dependent from allowable base independent claim, in addition to their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be removed and that these claims be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 13, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crowley in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,954,625 to Vorenkamp (hereinafter "Vorenkamp"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and respectfully request this rejection be removed and these claims be passed to allowance.

Claim 13 depends from independent claim 1, and claims 23 and 24 depend from independent claim 15. As discussed above, independent claims 1 and 15 are allowable over Crowley for the reasons mentioned above. Vorenkamp does not cure the defects of Crowley, nor does the Office Action allege this. Accordingly, dependent claims 13, 23, and 24 are allowable for at least being dependent from allowable base independent claim, in addition to their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request

that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be removed and that these claims be passed to allowance.

Claims 27-30, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crowley in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,678,012 to Belotserkovsky (hereinafter "Belotserkovsky"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and respectfully request this rejection be removed and that these claims be passed to allowance.

Independent claims 27 is allowable over Crowley for the reasons mentioned above. Belotserkovsky does not cure the defects of Crowley, nor does the Office Action allege this. Accordingly, independent claim 27 is allowable over the combination of Crowley in view of Belotserkovsky for the reasons mentioned above. Further, claims 28-30, and 32 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 27. Accordingly, claims 28-30, and 32 are allowable for at least being dependent from allowable base independent claim, in addition to their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be removed and that these claims be passed to allowance.

Claims 31 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crowley in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,678,012 to Belotserkovsky (hereinafter "Belotserkovsky"), and further in view of Vorenkamp. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and respectfully request this rejection be removed and these claims be passed to allowance.

Claims 31 and 33 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 27. Independent claims 27 is allowable over Crowley for the reasons mentioned above. Belotserkovsky and Vorenkamp do not cure the defects of Crowley, nor does the Office

Action allege this. Accordingly, claims 31 and 33 are allowable for at least being dependent from allowable base independent claim, in addition to their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be removed and that these claims be passed to allowance.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jeffrey T. Helvey  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,757

Date: 5/26/06

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600  
JTH/agj  
SKGFDCR\536629.1